

## SENATE—Thursday, August 20, 1987

## NOTICES OF HEARINGS

## SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the public that the Senate Special Committee on Aging has scheduled a field hearing on "Prescription Drugs and the Elderly: The High Cost of Growing Old—Part II."

The hearing will take place on Thursday, August 27, 1987, at 9:30 a.m. at the Pulaski Heights United Methodist Church, Woodlawn and Monroe Streets, in Little Rock, AR. The hearing will be chaired by committee member, DAVID PRYOR.

For further information please contact Max Richtman, staff director at (202) 224-5364 or Theresa Forster at (202) 224-2363.

Mr. President, I would like to announce for the public that the Special Committee on Aging has scheduled a hearing to receive testimony on the progress in enforcing and administering the Age Discrimination in Employment Act.

The hearing will take place on Friday, September 11, 1987 at 10 a.m. in room 628 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

For further information please contact Max Richtman, staff director, at (202) 224-5364.

## THE 1988 CENSUS DRESS REHEARSAL

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, on August 7 of this year the Joint Economic Committee held a hearing on the potential effects of the proposal by the Office of Management and Budget to drop from the 1988 census dress rehearsal roughly 30 questions hitherto scheduled for inclusion. The hearing reflected the longstanding concern of the Joint Economic Committee for the quality of the Federal statistical infrastructure and the belief that access to accurate, comprehensive and timely data is indispensable to sound decisionmaking. While full and reliable statistical information does not, in itself, constitute or inevitably lead to sound decisions, it plays an essential role in responsible decision-making in both the private and public sectors.

Because questions deleted from the 1988 dress rehearsal would also be omitted from the official 1990 Decennial Census, and because the proposed deletions would affect such critical areas as housing, employment and unemployment, transportation, mobility, and energy, the long-term ramifications of the OMB proposals require

very careful examination. Unfortunately the proposals were announced only on July 24 with September 14 the final deadline for all public comment, and the August 7 hearing was therefore an effort to draw together, on very short notice, the analyses now being developed by major users of census data all across the country. Given the short time available, many were able to submit their documentation only subsequent to the hearing, and I ask to have included in the RECORD but a few representative examples of the materials which reached the Joint Economic Committee shortly after the August 7 hearing:

## The material follows:

NATIONAL GOVERNORS' ASSOCIATION,  
Washington, DC, August 6, 1987.

HON. PAUL S. SARBANES,  
Chairman, Joint Economic Committee, U.S.  
Congress, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Office of Management and Budget attempt to eliminate critical questions from the Census questionnaires to be used in the 1988 Dress Rehearsal. As this information is vital to the functioning of our State governments, we have been particularly attentive to Census issues. In a letter of May 14, 1987 to Senator Pryor, Chairman, Subcommittee on Federal Services, Post Office, and Civil Service, U.S. Senate, we communicated support for the proposed 1990 Census content submitted to Congress by the Census Bureau. We believe that the items, determined through the extensive content development and testing program of the Bureau, represent the key items that are most important for decision making at the state level.

We, of course, were quite surprised to learn of the proposed OMB changes to the 1990 Census content. It is our understanding that OMB has been involved for a number of years in the formal mechanisms the Census Bureau established to identify data needs for the next Census. We are aware that OMB representatives not only participated in the local public meetings as observers but as participants in the subject-based inter-agency working groups of the Bureau. In addition, OMB established the Federal Agency Council on the 1990 Census specifically to participate in the content development process. They also participated in the budget review process that approved the local public meetings and related content development and testing activities of the Bureau. To our knowledge, throughout the process, OMB raised no significant concerns that would lead to the proposed elimination of roughly 30 questions. The OMB proposed question deletions, in fact, come at a time after the content development process peaked with the submission of the proposed content to Congress in March of this year.

The 1990 content subjects proposed to Congress have survived the winnowing process imposed by the Bureau to reduce the vast number of questions that were request-

ed during the national public comment process. Five broad principles guided the Bureau's selection of the subjects to be included in the 1990 Census. It is interesting that three of the five principles used by the Census Bureau for content selection appear as criteria used by OMB to delete questions.

Particularly troublesome is the fact that, the OMB has cited its responsibility under the Paperwork Reduction Act as a basis for its actions. This appears to us to be an inappropriate interpretation of the authority provided in the language of the Act. We do not believe the intent of the Act was to have a single agency's action supercede and overturn an entire data content development process including an extensive public comment mechanism and Congressional action.

Regarding paperwork reduction, we generally believe the potential for duplication and paperwork burden will only increase during the 1990's, if the content is changed as proposed by OMB. The questions slated for deletion are not superfluous, as Census Bureau documentation is likely to show. And additionally, by eliminating the 30 specified questions, the policy uses of the remaining 1990 Census questions will decrease. The subjects as presented to Congress are consistent, for the most part, with the 1980 Census which enhances the comparability of data between the decades. The elimination of items will diminish this benefit.

Several specific aspects of the OMB rationale warrant comment. While we cannot replicate, here in this letter, the tens of thousands of person hours involved in documenting how the data meet the pre-determined criteria for selection, we can offer a few specific examples.

First, OMB cites the fact that there are alternative sources available for obtaining the data in the questions proposed for deletion. We believe that there are no adequate substitutes for these data. These data not only serve to describe the demographic and housing conditions of the country in 1990; but the Census results also serve as benchmarks for numerous data series and play a key role in survey design work throughout the decade. Survey data are not adequate as a substitute for a variety of reasons including the fact that analysis is most often needed at highly localized geographic levels. For example, the Current Population Survey (CPS) would not be an adequate substitute for the labor force questions. The data obtained from surveys, such as the CPS, which is based on a national sample of households, contains detailed data for only a limited number of states and is therefore not sufficient in geographic detail for 50 state use.

Administrative records have limitations as well when being considered for use as alternative sources of data to the Census. For example, the IRS administrative data containing tax filers' addresses, if used as proxy for migration, by matching records over time, may indicate relative change in migration patterns during a specified time period but could not be used to estimate the levels of migration. We understand also that most of the IRS address records, included in attempts to report matches, remain un-

matched. Another example is the fertility data which are used in the population projections process. Birth certificate data are not an adequate substitute.

Second, OMB further stated that there was a scarcity of documented evidence that the data resulting from the census would serve important purposes. Several examples will illustrate that these data are crucial for state policy planning, program enactment and fund allocation. The fertility and migration data are used by State Education agencies to adjust school enrollment estimates that are used to allocate State education funds, which average about 37% of annual state budgets, to purchase textbooks and other materials and to employ staff. Another example is the housing questions such as tenure, rent, mobility and the type of rooms in the unit. As the nature of housing problems shifts, from a focus on housing quality to affordability, state housing agencies must create an adequate baseline of housing finance data.

A third point raised by OMB was that the data in the questions targeted for deletion are not needed at highly localized geographic levels. The 1990 Census is the most crucial of the data resources available to aid transportation officials manage the shifting size and character of work-trip commuting that is placing strong demands on the local transportation infrastructure. Census journey-to-work questions have been particularly important determinants in examining the transportation planning process and dispelling population change as a principal indicator to support transportation improvements. In addition, the data are vital to the areas of traffic operations and management, transport system planning and development, transit routing and system planning, government organization and programs and metropolitan development and governance.

Data reliability, another concern of OMB, is reasonable, however it should not be the sole basis to eliminate questions that have been determined to be essential by other criteria. The solution to data reliability questions is not to eliminate the data from the data collection test. Rather these are the items that should be included on the 1958 Dress Rehearsal questionnaires so that the reliability issues can be addressed and the data collection methods improved by 1990.

In closing, we believe that the process undertaken by the Census Bureau was thorough and perhaps the most intensive in the history of Census taking preparation. Taking this extensive public involvement process into account, along with the role Congress has played and will play in overseeing Census activities, the Congress may well want to revisit the role of the Paperwork Act activities in relation to Census activities and consider exempting the Census questionnaire from such provisions.

Again we appreciate the opportunity to express our views on the 1990 Census.

Sincerely,

RAYMOND C. SCHEPPACH.

STATE OF GEORGIA,  
OFFICE OF PLANNING AND BUDGET,  
Atlanta, GA, August 10, 1987.

HON. PAUL SARBANES,  
Chairman, Joint Economic Committee,  
Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN SARBANES: Enclosed is a copy of the response from Governor Joe Frank Harris to the proposed changes in the content of the 1990 Census of Population and Housing.

This is to request that Governor Harris' letter be included in the Record of Hearing held August 7, 1987, regarding the Office of Management and Budget's proposed deletions.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

CLARK T. STEVENS,  
Director.

STATE OF GEORGIA,  
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,  
Atlanta, GA, August 7, 1987.

WENDY GRAMM, Ph.D.,  
Administrator, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, U.S. Office of Management and Budget, Washington, DC.

DEAR DR. GRAMM: This letter is in response to the Office of Management and Budget's proposed changes in the content of the 1990 Census of Population and Housing. Census data is widely used in Georgia for policy making, planning, program development, and in many other areas. We have often needed more data than that which was available from the decennial censuses; therefore, the proposed deletions of some questions from the 1990 questionnaires is very disturbing. Although some of the data may be available in the form of estimates from private vendors, much of the data can only be obtained from the decennial Census of Population and Housing.

In particular, from the population section, the data on residence five years ago and transportation/time to work (questions 14 and 23-24) is widely used for determining migration trends and transportation planning. Also, data on work and transportation disabilities is very difficult to obtain and affects such a small percentage of the total population, that to move those questions to the sample form may seriously affect the availability and validity of the resulting data.

With regard to the housing section, this data is used to target housing revitalization efforts, to determine low income energy assistance payments, weatherization programs, community development block grants, and for a variety of other planning functions. Deleting these questions, especially question numbers H6, 9, 10a, 12, 13, 15-18, and 21-28, would seriously impact numerous programs and policy decisions in Georgia.

It is with these points in mind that I request that you reconsider the decision to delete these questions from the 1990 census.

With kindest regards, I remain

Sincerely,

JOE FRANK HARRIS.

[Telegram]

CARMEL, CA, August 7, 1987.

Senator PAUL SARBANES,  
Chairman, Joint Economic Committee,  
Dirksen Senate Office Bldg., Washington DC.

Thank you for your attention to the problems that would be created by the elimination of important housing employment and transportation questions from the 1988 census dress rehearsal and ultimately from the 1990 census. Yesterday, the U.S. Conference of Mayors notified the Office of Management and Budget that it opposed the proposal to drop these questions. This is a time when all levels of government must stretch scarce resources to meet growing needs, it is not a time to take away the data we need to manage those scarce resources or measure those growing needs.

Members of the executive committee and advisory board, U.S. Conference of Mayors, assembled August 7, 1987; Richard L. Berkley, mayor of Kansas City, President.

STATE OF MARYLAND,  
REGIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL,  
Baltimore, MD, August 10, 1987.

HON. PAUL S. SARBANES,  
U.S. Senate, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR SARBANES: I want to bring to your attention the Regional Planning Council's (RPC's) concerns over recent developments regarding the upcoming 1990 Census. The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) has asked the Census Bureau to shorten the Draft 1990 Census Survey Questionnaire dramatically. They propose accomplishing this through the elimination of several questions relating to the labor force status and commute to work of resident workers, population migration patterns, and housing cost indicators.

The RPC is concerned that information essential to our work will be eliminated if the OMB plan is implemented. The proposed deletions are particularly disconcerting in light of the extensive review, refinement, and public outreach process undertaken by the Census Bureau in developing the original questionnaire—a process which has yielded a fair compromise between the needs of the many local, state and federal agencies requiring accurate census information. Enclosed is a copy of a letter sent to OMB by the Executive Director of RPC which presents critical comments from a planning staff perspective.

We would greatly appreciate your consideration of this matter and support in the upcoming Congressional Hearings.

Thank you for your concern.

Sincerely,

GEORGE F. HARRISON, Jr.,  
Chairman.

STATE OF MARYLAND,  
REGIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL,  
Baltimore, MD, August 7, 1987.

DONALD R. ARBUCKLE  
Assistant Chief, OIRA, Office of Management and Budget, New Executive Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. ARBUCKLE: The purpose of this letter is to communicate the concern of the Baltimore Regional Planning Council staff over the proposed deletion of questions on the most recent Draft 1990 Census survey questionnaire. The proposal set forth by the Office of Management and Budget calls for the elimination of questions relating to the labor force status and commute to work of resident workers, population migration patterns, and housing cost indicators. Failure to provide for a systematic, consistent national data collection effort on these items as part of the decennial census effort would restrict our future work at both a local and metropolitan level and hinder our ability to conduct comparative analyses with prior years' data and with other regions of the country.

The current census format is the product of an extensive review, refinement, and public outreach program administered by the Census Bureau in recent years. The questionnaire now represents a fair compromise among the various groups that offered input during the public hearing process. Introducing major changes at this point would violate that process.



The proposed changes will limit the base of observed statistics on key transportation, demographic, and housing indicators. This information, as collected through past census efforts, has been relied upon heavily for preparing and checking our planning forecasts and in detecting and monitoring emerging trends at the metropolitan level and below. In addition, the availability of statistics for other regions has bolstered our ability to compare regional and subarea patterns against those of other regions of the country.

Census-reported statistics on commuting have proven to be a valuable data resource in understanding the travel-generating characteristics of various types of development. Small area data on automobile ownership patterns, reported travel mode, and time for commuter trips have contributed greatly to transportation planning studies focusing on current, as well as long-range, issues facing the region and its political jurisdictions.

The availability of these data items in a consistent format, for both the local area and other areas across the nation, has enabled us to respond to information needs which extend beyond the immediate Baltimore area. For example, recent transportation studies conducted with the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments required the integration of small area census data for 1980 from both the Baltimore and Washington, D.C. regions. Much of this work could not have been performed had the information on travel time and mode not been available for both regions in a consistent, small-area format.

In addition, census data on housing and population have proven critical to our work in transportation, economic development, and human resource planning. Our agency relies upon this information to support studies of housing quality, affordability, and adequacy. Census-reported information on birth rates and migration patterns in relied upon heavily by state and local agencies in demographic trends analysis and forecasting efforts. These socioeconomic forecasts, in turn, form the basis for critical decisions on infrastructure planning and improvements at all levels of government.

Finally, we are planning to use local funds to support a data collection effort which will complement the 1990 census. Prior to and during the census effort, we intend to collect information on noncommuting travel behavior, as well as overall transportation systems usage. The proposed questionnaire deletions would undermine and invalidate this local initiative and no doubt similar local initiatives being taken across the nation. To undertake a large data collection effort compensating for the proposed deletions would far outstrip the funding resources available for planning in the region.

In summary, we feel that the 1990 Census will be seriously weakened if the proposed Office of Management and Budget recommendations are implemented. We feel that the census format originally proposed by the Census Bureau should be retained.

Sincerely,

ALFRED P. GWYN, Jr.  
Executive Director.

CONSORTIUM OF SOCIAL  
SCIENCE ASSOCIATIONS,  
Washington, DC, August 7, 1987.

Hon. PAUL SARBANES,  
Chairman, Joint Economic Committee,  
Dirksen Senate Office Building, Wash-  
ington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR SARBANES: We applaud your calling hearings concerning the attempt by OMB to eliminate and downgrade questions concerning housing and other important issues from the 1990 census questionnaire.

The enclosed letter indicates our feelings about this unfortunate policy proposal from OMB. As an organization that has spent the past few years investigating OMB's attempts to diminish information collection, (we helped the House Science and Technology Committee to push for a GAO investigation of OMB's information collection clearance policies), we hope you will use all the power at your disposal to stop this proposal from going forward.

The Consortium of Social Science Associations (COSSA) represents 185,000 American scientists across the broad range of social and behavioral science disciplines. A list of COSSA Members, Affiliates, and Contributors is attached.

Thank you for your time and attention. If you have any questions please feel free to call us.

Sincerely,

HOWARD J. SILVER,  
Associate Director for  
Government Relations.

Enclosure.

CONSORTIUM OF SOCIAL  
SCIENCE ASSOCIATIONS,  
Washington, DC, August 6, 1987.

Hon. JAMES C. MILLER, III,  
Director, Office of Management and Budget,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR DIRECTOR MILLER: I am writing to express COSSA's concern about OMB's proposal to eliminate certain items from the 1988 Census Dress Rehearsal Questionnaire and to downgrade others to the sample component of that questionnaire. The collection of information, particularly in the methodical way of the decennial census, should be a major responsibility of the national government in a federal system. Good public policy planning and analysis depend on good data. The Paperwork Reduction Act should not be utilized to justify the loss of information vital to those who must make public and private policy decision affecting the future of this nation.

Data on housing and household trends which you propose to eliminate reveal future needs, not only for housing and construction, but for highways, schools, water and sewer lines, and other services and facilities important to state and local governments. Researchers in housing policy note that your proposed elimination and downgrading of housing items will make it difficult to collect crucial data necessary for local planning agencies to qualify for Federal programs. For example, the development of Housing Assistance Plans necessary for Community Development Block Grant applications require the kind of data you propose to eliminate. In addition, the need to measure physical quality and affordability and the need to estimate energy consumption and expenditures will also be lost. Many states and localities rely on the data from the housing census to develop housing needs profiles and to provide benchmarks in developing follow-up studies. State and local government collection of this data would

not be cost-effective and information collection of this nature should be a federal responsibility. The housing items proposed for elimination should be restored to the questionnaire.

At a time when the Committee on National Statistics of the National Academy of Sciences has recommended the enhancement of fertility statistics, you are proposing to eliminate the question on the census that deals with this important issue. This seems short-sighted and unfortunate. In addition, when warnings of a 'birth dearth' are being debated, accurate information about fertility rates and patterns would help enlighten the debate as it moves from books and magazines to the public policy arena. The fertility item should be restored to the questionnaire.

The Consortium of Social Science Associations (COSSA) represents 185,000 American scientists across the wide spectrum of the social and behavioral sciences, many of whom rely on census data for their research and policy analysis. A list of COSSA's Members, Affiliates, and Contributors is attached.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,

DAVID JENNESS,  
Executive Director.  
HOWARD J. SILVER,  
Associate Director for  
Government Relations.

CONSORTIUM OF SOCIAL SCIENCE  
ASSOCIATIONS

#### MEMBERS

American Anthropological Association.  
American Economic Association.  
American Historical Association.  
American Political Science Association.  
American Psychological Association.  
American Sociological Association.  
American Statistical Association.  
Association of American Geographers.  
Association of American Law Schools.  
Linguistic Society of America.

#### AFFILIATES

American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business.  
American Association for Public Opinion Research.  
American Educational Research Association.  
American Society of Criminology.  
Association for Asian Studies.  
Association for the Social Sciences in Health.  
Eastern Sociological Society.  
Gerontological Society of America.  
History of Science Society.  
International Studies Association.  
Law and Society Association.  
Midwest Sociological Society.  
National Council on Family Relations.  
National Council for the Social Studies.  
North Central Sociological Association.  
Northeastern Anthropological Association.  
Operations Research Society of America.  
Population Association of America.  
Regional Science Association.  
Rural Sociological Society.  
Social Science History Association.  
Society for the History of Technology.  
Society for Research on Adolescence.  
Society for Research in Child Development.  
Society for the Scientific Study of Religion.  
Southern Sociological Society.  
Southwestern Social Science Association.

Speech Communication Association.  
The Institute of Management Sciences.

## CONTRIBUTORS

American Council of Learned Societies.  
University of California, Berkeley.  
University of California, Irvine.  
University of California, Los Angeles.  
University of California, San Diego.  
University of California, Santa Barbara.  
Carnegie-Mellon University.  
Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences.  
University of Chicago.  
University of Colorado.  
Columbia University.  
Cornell Institute for Social and Economic Research.  
Cornell University.  
Florida State University.  
Harvard University.  
Howard University.  
University of Illinois.  
Indiana University.  
Institute for Research in Social Science, UNC-Chapel Hill.  
Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan.  
University of Iowa.  
The Johns Hopkins University.  
University of Maryland.  
Massachusetts Institute of Technology.  
Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs, Syracuse University.  
University of Michigan.  
University of Missouri.  
National Opinion Research Center.  
University of Nebraska.  
New York University.  
University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.  
Ohio State University.  
University of Oregon.  
University of Pennsylvania.  
Pennsylvania State University.  
University of Pittsburgh.  
Princeton University.  
Rutgers University.  
Social Science Research Council.  
University of Southern California.  
Stanford University.  
State University of New York at Stony Brook.  
University of Tennessee, Knoxville.  
Texas A & M University.  
Tulane University.  
University of Virginia.  
University of Washington.  
University of Wisconsin, Madison.  
University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee.  
Yale University.

AUGUST 6, 1987.

We, the undersigned, scholars and users of the Census, wish to register our strong objection to the changes in the content of the 1990 Decennial Census of Population and Housing proposed by the Office of Management and Budget.

Our objection is two-fold: we disagree profoundly with the substance of the changes as will be described later in this letter. But we also take equal umbrage with the manner in which these changes are being proposed. Why were these proposals not made long enough ago that they might be discussed at those public meetings whose very purpose it is to examine such matters? Why has so little time been allowed for public response? Why was the summer vacation-time chosen as the period in which to make a brief announcement of what amounts to a major public policy change? If these changes to the Census are in fact worthy ones, then they should be able to bear reasonable, thorough public scrutiny.

As for the substance of the proposed changes, we object in general to dropping questions except those which have become historically irrelevant because questions asked on previous Censuses are an important part of the historical record of the United States. Yet we understand that it is being proposed to drop almost half of the questions. Is it possible that nearly half of the questions on the Census have become obsolete within a ten-year period?

There is far more at stake than the quantity of the information which the Census reveals. It is the quality of the data which would be compromised by dropping many of the questions. The Census alone provides adequate benchmarks for defining the samples of other surveys. Only the Census includes information on as many people as it does. Only the Census combines so much demographic and economic data on such a scale. As an example, consider the labor force questions from the Current Population Survey—the answers to which determine our national employment data. This vital data would be far more biased if the labor force participation questions were dropped from the Census. The real value of questions asked on the Census is that unlike other sources of data, Census provides numbers which can be associated with a wealth of demographic and other material. Losing this connectedness would be a national tragedy.

The principles that are at stake here are: that of responsible governance whereby major public policy changes ought not to be made until they have been publicly and most carefully considered; and that of maintaining the worth of our most important national survey which is done by assuring its quality, its consistency, and its completeness.

Christine C. de Fontenay, Steven S. Smith, Clifford M. Winston, Kenneth S. Flamm, Edward J. Lincoln, Charles L. Schultze, Richard Goode, Gilbert Y. Steiner, Robert A. Katzman, Henry J. Aaron, Martin N. Baily, Edward M. Bernstein, Rose M. Rubin, Ralph C. Bryant, Weir M. Brown, Gary T. Burtless, John S. Earle, Alfred Reifman, Barry Bosworth, Stephen Hess, Samuel Kernell, Bruce MacLaury, Paul E. Peterson.

UNIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAME,

August 10, 1987.

Hon. PAUL SARBANES,  
Chairman, Joint Economic Committee,  
Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR SARBANES: It has come to my attention that the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) has "suggested that certain questions be dropped" from the 1990 Decennial Census questionnaire.

First, the Bureau of Census has held extensive public hearing and seminars soliciting information about the 1990 Census and the questions which should and should not be asked. They have volumes of information at their disposal. They are the statisticians of the federal government with a great deal of expertise. To my recollection, I have not heard of any public meetings or seminars being held by the OMB as to questions for the 1990 Census. Just who does OMB think they are and based on what expertise does OMB question the Census on its carefully constructed questionnaire? Particularly at this late date and with little or no public input. Census knows its users and should not be asked to unduly justify questions so important to the nation.

Second, let me provide you with examples of usages by the local level, "nitty-gritty" users of the Census information.

(1) A local bank used the "residence five years ago" to plan its new branch.

(2) The MACOG (Michiana Area Council of Governments) uses the utility information in planning for another oil embargo by identifying areas which would be hardest hit if oil prices escalated. Again, migration information and "mode and travel time to work" is used in charting the growth of the area and planning transportation needs, roads, etc. "Rent and value" is used in tax planning.

(3) Small business uses the statistics in placing new small businesses and assessing expansion of existing business concerns.

(4) Our MBA students use this information in planning their marketing strategies for classroom assignments. This same methodology is then continued by them on the job with large and small firms.

Third, let me address the OMB reasons for deleting the questions.

(1) "A scarcity of documented evidence—such as for policy planning purposed, program enactment or other broadly based public need—that the resulting data would serve important purposes." As stated above the Census Bureau has held extensive hearings and meetings, for which there are transcripts and reports. I, as a participant, have received such transcripts. OMB need only to ask for these. I have also indicated above that the local governmental unit MACOG as well as other city offices (ie. police, transportation,) and small business concerns, all use these statistics. OMB has obviously not checked with any of the local planning groups or local government before putting forth this argument.

(2) "Data resulting from some of the items are not necessary at highly localized geographic levels." The Michiana Area Council of Government is not interested in state level information, neither is the City of South Bend's transportation department. They are interested only in highly localized geographic levels of information directly within their administrative view. The small local business is not establishing a nationwide local business and needs only highly localized geographic level information, usually within the city and county. Again, OMB has not checked with the Small Business Administration concerning what information needs the local small business has and what statistical agency or survey answers those questions.

(3) "Some data items are not required uniformly across the nation." Again I differ with the OMB. Most transportation agencies of local government, county or regions will be using the information provided by the Census. True, it may not be uniformly required, but local units through the Census Bureau's State Data Center Program manipulates the given data into useful reports.

(4) "Some are available from alternative sources." In some cases true, but not uniform or a reliable source. The difficulties of entering, validating, and merging information from various sources make the resulting statistics less than reliable. The OMB continues to put this reason forward. The Census Bureau has been collecting information for over 100 years. Their methodology and validity is well known and used by the users of statistics. Alternative sources would introduce undue costs and statistical error to any endeavor.

(5) "Some of the questions would yield data that would not be sufficiently reli-



able." The questions identified by OMB contain less statistical error and are more reliable than others left in the questionnaire. The Census Bureau has been improving the reliability of its statistics and has discussed this issue at its public meetings. The statistical community is well aware of the faults of the statistics but has adapted and is quite capable of using the statistics. The absence of any information is not as desirable as having data with a known statistical error associated with it.

Finally, OMB has waged, in my opinion, a systematic war on the statistical evidence of our nation. In presuming to question the 1990 Census, it is obvious that the OMB does not know about the uses of the statistics the Census provides and that they are unaware of the Census Bureau's continuing program of evaluation. If the OMB had familiarized themselves with the Census Bureau and its programs and the information available to it (OMB), the "suggested" deletions would not have been made.

I am asking that you communicate to OMB (1) that your constituents do use information at the "Highly localized area" and that (2) the OMB should check their facts before assuming that their (OMB) knowledge about the statistical user community and needs of the citizens is better than a much larger, high specialized agency who is constantly reviewing its programs such as the Bureau of the Census.

My time is valuable. The constant battle between OMB and the Statistics-user community is time consuming and wasteful. The Paperwork Reduction Act, used so frequently as a reason for OMB action, has done little to reduce the amount of time and paper I must expend fighting OMB action on statistical and other issues.

I thank you for your attention to this important matter. I will be happy to discuss this with anyone from your office if you would like.

Respectfully,

STEPHEN M. HAYES,  
Reference and Public  
Documents Librarian.

OFFICE OF COUNTY EXECUTIVE,  
Ellicott City, MD, August 7, 1987.

Senator PAUL SARBANES,  
Dirksen Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR SARBANES: It has come to our attention that the Office of Management and Budget is proposing the deletion of an alarming number of data items from the questionnaire designed for use in the 1990 Census, and Howard County recommends firmly the retention of these questions in order to ensure the retrieval of invaluable data toward the making of informed decisions at the local level.

Therefore, please find attached a copy of my letter addressed to Donald R. Arbuckle of the Office of Management and Budget detailing our reasons for this recommendation, and I shall appreciate your careful consideration and active concurrence with these expressed needs of good government at the local level.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM E. EAKLE,  
Acting County Executive.

OFFICE OF COUNTY EXECUTIVE,  
Ellicott City, MD, August 7, 1987.

Mr. DONALD R. ARBUCKLE,  
Assistant Chief, OIRA, Office of Management and Budget, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. ARBUCKLE: Since writing a brief letter yesterday to your associate Ms.

Wendy Gramm expressing the County's opposition to the deletion of important population, transportation-related and housing questions from the 1990 Census, it has come to our attention that a slightly more detailed rationale for our recommendation is in order.

Accordingly, the following programmatic applications of Census data would be seriously curtailed for this local government by the deletion of these essential questions for the 1990 Census: (1) residence five years ago is a basic factor in immigration and, therefore, population forecasting; (2) mode of transportation to work, carpooling, time of departure and travel time to work are not only key elements in transportation and traffic modeling, but the basis for such essential issues as commuting patterns, land use and highway planning; (3) all questions related to the residential labor force are critical to economic development and planning, and are vital to a County located centrally in the Washington-Baltimore corridor; and (4) each of the housing questions proposed for deletion have provided invaluable data for County planning and decision-making in the areas of housing and human service delivery systems. Perhaps the greatest loss, however, would be the ability to cross-tabulate these essential data items for the ongoing process of General Plan development, comprehensive zoning and budgetary forecasts. In addition, much of this information is required in the background narrative for Community Development Block Grant applications, as well as Section 3, Section 4(i) and Section 18 grant applications to the Urban Mass Transit Administration.

For these reasons, we shall be extremely interested in seeing the level of statistical information derived from the decennial Census remain (at the very least) at the fine standard achieved in 1980.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM E. EAKLE,  
Acting County Executive.

IBA,  
August 7, 1987.

Representative LEE HAMILTON,  
Rayburn House Office Building,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE HAMILTON: It has come to our attention that the Bureau of the Census may be reducing the number of questions on the schedule for the 1990 census.

The response to such inquiries during each census provide an invaluable data resource which is used by government agencies, businesses and educational institutions to evaluate the needs of the citizens of our country.

We anticipate you may be interested in this action by the Census Bureau. Enclosed is a photocopy of a letter to Donald R. Arbuckle of the Office of Management and Budget expressing our concerns about reducing the amount of important census data.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM H. KING,  
Executive Vice President.

INDIANA BANKERS ASSOCIATION,  
Indianapolis, IN, August 5, 1987.

DONALD R. ARBUCKLE,  
Office of Management and Budget,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. ARBUCKLE: We have just discovered that, on the direction of the federal Office of Management and Budget, the

Bureau of the Census will have to cut many questions from the schedule for the 1990 Census.

The data which would be lost under this proposal would impair the ability of many forms of business and educators to adequately respond to the needs of the citizens of our county. It would seem that if we are to take the time to conduct a census, the gathering of all pertinent data is extremely important.

We would encourage you to carefully evaluate the need for this data and reconsider its deletion.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM H. KING,  
Executive Vice President.

INDIANA 15 REGIONAL PLANNING  
COMMISSION,  
Huntingburg, IN, August 7, 1987.

Re: 1990 Census.  
Mr. DONALD R. ARBUCKLE,  
Office of Management and Budget,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. ARBUCKLE: I understand that OMB is planning to drop almost half the questions from the 1990 Census Questionnaire. I find this most appalling in light of the great need to evaluate the growth of our country and plan for the needs of the future.

I also do not fully understand what cost-saving could be anticipated. Particularly if you compare the cost-savings to the benefits lost!

Please reconsider your proposal and keep the 1990 Census Questionnaire 100% complete.

Thank you for your time and consideration with this matter. Should you have any questions or comments, please call my office.

Sincerely,

ROBERT P. GREWE,  
Executive Director.

LEXINGTON FAYETTE URBAN COUNTY  
GOVERNMENT,  
Lexington, KY, August 5, 1987.

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON,  
Vice Chairman,  
Joint Economic Committee,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR VICE CHAIRMAN HAMILTON: We just learned of action by the U.S. Office of Management and Budget which could have a very detrimental impact on the functioning of our local government. It relates to a directive issued recently by OMB to the U.S. Census Bureau to cut approximately 30 questions which are scheduled to be included in the 1988 Census Dress Rehearsal in preparation for the 1990 Census. The elimination of these data could seriously impair the planning functions of this government.

My Division of Planning informs me that the loss of certain housing and transportation data would seriously diminish our efforts to assess neighborhood conditions, analyze transportation facilities and target public transit. Specific information needed by the Division of Planning include: value of home, rent, residence five years ago, public sewer, number of bedrooms, number of autos, transportation/time to work, and labor force information.

We utilize these data for all our urban planning as well as for assessing and determining pockets of poverty for purposes of our enterprise zone and certain CDBG and UDAG projects, among myriad other projects. The OMB directive essentially

eliminates necessary census data at the block level.

In your review of the aforementioned OMB action, I urge you to consider the very detrimental impact this could have on the functioning of local governments as well as businesses and industries which also rely on these data. Please restore these essential data to the 1988 Dress Rehearsal and the 1990 Census.

Sincerely,

SCOTTY BAESLER  
Mayor.

INDIANA UNIVERSITY,  
SCHOOL OF BUSINESS,  
Bloomington, IN, August 4, 1987.

Congressman LEE H. HAMILTON,  
Rayburn House Office Building,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR LEE: OMB is doing it again.

The Office of Management and Budget has instructed the Bureau of the Census to eliminate significant data elements from the 1990 Census. It is disguised as applicable to the St. Louis test run, but it means that vital information would be lost for the full-scale run in 1990.

That directive must be reversed. If not, American business will lose data on, among other things:

- The migration of the population;
- The value of owner-occupied housing;
- The amount of rent paid;
- The type of fuels used for water and space heating;
- Labor force participation details; and
- Transportation to work detail.

Our office serves hundreds of small businesses across Indiana. We know the value of these data, not for academic research (which is not an unworthy cause), but for practical business decisions. The sad part is that the small business owner will think that a reduced questionnaire is to be cheered. The loss will never be known until time of need. Then that same person will wonder why we do not have such data to help him or her and will make some derisive remark about the inadequacy of federal programs.

Please, on behalf of Hoosier businesses, make an effort to protect the 1990 Census from these new destructive incursions by OMB.

Best regards,

MORTON J. MARCUS  
Director.

AUGUST 11, 1987.

Mr. DONALD R. ARBUCKLE,  
Office of Management and Budget,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. ARBUCKLE: We are writing to express our deepest concern about OMB's decision to eliminate a number of items from the 1990 Census Questionnaire. We are not insensitive to OMB's desire to reduce paperwork for respondents, and we are not in a position to contend that each and every question in the survey is indispensable. But OMB's hit-list of questions seems unreasonably expansive.

Our office frequently receives requests for census data. Over the years, these requests have covered virtually every data item in the census. The community really does use the data—all of the data—produced by the Census Bureau.

As the designated Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the urbanized area, we are particularly alarmed about the possibility that certain transportation-related questions (travel mode, work travel times,

number, of automobiles per household) may be eliminated. This information is necessary for the MPO to meet its federally-required urban transportation planning responsibilities, specifically with regard to traffic modeling and forecasting. One of the greatest improvements in recent censuses has been the inclusion of several transportation questions—sparing communities the need to perform (usually with federal funds) expensive and time-consuming surveys.

The Planning Department also makes use of census information related to migration patterns, labor force composition, number of bedrooms, group housing, tenure, and similar items in formulating growth and development policies for the Bloomington urbanized area. This data is important not only to the urban transportation planning process, but also in comprehensive planning matters. We are strongly opposed to OMB's recommendation to eliminate certain questions covering the aforementioned areas, or to move others from the 100% survey to the sample survey.

The Census Bureau did not devise the 1990 questionnaire without considerable input from data users. Our agency has participated in some of the public meetings and workshops sponsored in local and regional areas by the Census Bureau. We understand that the Bureau has also met extensively with congressional representatives, government agencies, special interest groups, and other interested parties as part of the question selection process.

We further reject the notion that much of the data slated for elimination is available through other sources. Only the census consistently provides data at the census tract, neighborhood, and sometimes even at the block level. Moreover, data items which are available elsewhere are usually collected by the Census Bureau for the purpose of permitting ready cross-tabulations with other data.

The decennial census is an invaluable source of information. We believe that OMB's proposed trimming of the 1990 questionnaire would have significant and negative impact on the local planning process. Please reconsider your decision very carefully before action is taken on this matter. The census project is too important to do otherwise.

Thank you for the opportunity to express our opinions.

Sincerely,

TED E. SKINNER,  
Senior Planner.  
(For Timothy A. Mueller,  
Planning Director).

HOOSIER ENERGY,  
RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE, INC.,  
Bloomington, IN, August 13, 1987.  
Mr. DONALD R. ARBUCKLE,  
Office of Management and Budget, NEOB,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. ARBUCKLE: It has come to our attention that the Office of Management and Budget has informed the Bureau of the Census that many questions are to be deleted from the 1990 census. While we all object to senseless census questions, we are concerned that additional deletion of questions in the 1990 census will virtually render useless much of the data base we and other utilities use in power requirements studies and consumer marketing surveys.

Of particular interest to us are questions on type of fuel used for space and water heating, number of bedrooms in homes, value of owner occupied homes, amount of

rent paid, data on automobile ownership, travel time to work, other means of transportation, and place of residence in 1985, just to mention a few. As well, there are many other questions related to the general areas that these specific questions represent which are of great importance in our marketing and investment planning. Additionally, the thousands of businesses and industries we supply power to in southern Indiana rely on data from the census for their planning, which would be severely affected if any more questions were deleted from the 1990 census.

Thank you for your time and consideration of this most important matter which does directly affect the more than half-a-million residents, businesses and industries we serve.

Sincerely,

DOUG STAUCH,  
Manager of Information Services.

DETROIT REGIONAL CENSUS  
ADVISORY COUNCIL,  
Detroit, MI, August 10, 1987.

Dr. WENDY GRAMM,  
Administrator, Office of Information and  
Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, Washington, DC.

DEAR DR. GRAMM: The Detroit Regional Census Advisory Council is gravely concerned about the proposed reduction of questions for the 1990 Census. The Council, as indicated by the attached membership list, includes representatives of the major data producers and users in southeast Michigan.

We believe that this decision is ill-advised and should be reversed; the 1988 Dress Rehearsal questionnaire should be approved as submitted by the Bureau of the Census.

The Census Bureau has conducted a long and thorough process leading to development of this questionnaire. Federal government needs were identified through the Federal Agency Council, chaired by your office. Other governmental needs, as well as those of the general public, were ascertained through a long series of local public meetings beginning in 1984. Legislation and governmental regulations requiring use of census data have been reviewed at all levels. To meet these needs, the questions proposed for deletion must be included.

Let me cite just a few examples:

- \* The labor force questions provide data used to determine ratios for estimating unemployment levels and rates for sub-county areas. These are used in Job Training Partnership Act funding.

- \* The item on place of residence five years ago provides the measurement of migration: the patterns and characteristics of people moving from one place to another. A benchmark derived from these data is important for interpreting migration rates derived from matched income tax returns as used in population estimates. The erstwhile General Revenue Sharing program and others depend on these numbers.

- \* Rent and value provide the only socioeconomic measure available for very small areas, including voting precincts. The fact that respondents may misstate value, estimating it too high, is unimportant because the item is used to compare one area to another, rather than for its absolute value.

Vehicles available is critical for planning for public transit needs in an era of scarce resources.

The Decennial Census is the premier data collection activity of the nation. Because its constitutionally mandated function requires



that every household and every resident be contacted, it is unique as a vehicle for collecting the variety of auxiliary information that is so important for the wide range of planning and decision making over a ten-year period.

For this reason, we do not believe that the Decennial Census should be viewed as a paperwork burden at all. Fifteen minutes, or even 45 minutes, of a household's time once in ten years is a minimal effort to spend for this very important result. If paperwork needs to be reduced, let us find other vehicles for that effort. The Decennial Census should be left alone.

We hope that, with the additional information that has been presented to you by both the Bureau of the Census and the data user community throughout the nation, you will see fit to reverse the decision made on July 24 and proceed forthwith to approve the questionnaire as submitted.

Sincerely,

PATRICIA C. BECKER,  
Chairperson.

Enclosure: Membership roster.

DETROIT REGIONAL CENSUS ADVISORY  
COUNCIL MEMBERSHIP LIST

Donna D. Atkinson, Greater Detroit Area Health Council, Detroit.

Patricia C. Becker, City of Detroit Planning Department, Detroit.

Peter Bernard, Independent Consultant, Detroit.

Claude J. Brittingham, United Community Services, Detroit.

Bill Brown, Livingston County Planning Department, Howell.

Barbara Bryant, Market Opinion Research Co., Detroit.

Dr. Roy J. Butz, Oakland Schools, Pontiac.

Doris Detwiler, Detroit Public Library, Detroit.

Howard Face, Michigan Bell Telephone Co., Detroit.

Denise Flynn, Washtenaw County Metro Planning Comm., Ann Arbor.

James Frederick, Michigan Cancer Foundation, Detroit.

Judith Goetz, Numbercrunchers, Detroit.

Paul Good, Southeast Michigan Council of Governments, Detroit.

David Hay, Oakland County Planning Division, Pontiac.

Charles Henry, Detroit Police Department, Detroit.

Cornelius Henry, Southeastern Michigan Transit Authority, Detroit.

Don Hoag, Detroit News, Detroit.

Jeffrey Jenks, Michigan Department of Civil Rights, Detroit.

Mark Kohl, Community Mental Health Services, Detroit.

Gordon Lambert, Oakland County Community Develop. Div., Pontiac.

Winston Lang, NAACP—Detroit Branch, Detroit.

Edward Limoges, Southeast Michigan Council of Governments, Detroit.

Von D. Logan, Michigan Employment Security Commission, Detroit.

Amy Majeske, Wayne State University Computing Center, Detroit.

Peter Mallory, St. Clair County Planning Dept., Port Huron.

Ellen McCarthy, Michigan Department of Civil Rights, Detroit.

Donald Morandini, Macomb County Planning Commission, Mt. Clemens.

Jeffrey Moyer, R.L. Polk Co., Detroit.

Frank Nagy, Monroe County Planning Department, Monroe.

Mark Neithercut, MIMIC/CUS, Wayne State University, Detroit.

Michael Ponder, Pontiac School District, Pontiac.

Barbara Rennie, Detroit Urban League, Detroit.

Kenneth Riopelle, Sandy Corp., Troy.

Maurice Roach, Wayne County Office of Economic Develop., Detroit.

Robyn Rontal, Botsford General Hospital, Farm. Hills.

Ronald Ropke, United Foundation, Detroit.

Gary Sands, Development Research Associates, Inc., Plymouth.

William Simmons, National Bank of Detroit, Troy.

Sue Smock, Wayne State Univ., Ctr. for Urban Studies, Detroit.

Denny Stavros, Detroit Public Schools, Detroit.

John R. Steiner, Greater Detroit Chamber of Commerce, Detroit.

Thomasina Tucker, City of Detroit Planning Department, Detroit.

Horacio Vargas, New Detroit, Inc., Detroit.

Susan Wachsberg, Detroit Free Press, Detroit.

Gary Wilson, Michigan Chronicle, Detroit.

Anne Zald, Wayne State University, Purdy Library, Detroit.

Saad E. Zara, Detroit Edison Company, Detroit.

LIAISON REPRESENTATIVES

Dwight Dean, U.S. Bureau of the Census, Detroit.

Robert C. Graham, GLS Region V Planning and Development, Flint.

Kurt Metzger, U.S. Bureau of the Census, Detroit.

Billie Thon, Dept. of Housing and Urban Development, Detroit.

[Mailgram]

BOSTON, MA, August 6, 1987.

HON. PAUL S. SARBANES,  
Joint Economic Committee, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR SARBANES: As the officer who maintains Massachusetts records and supervises our State census, I strongly object to the Office of Management and Budgets decision to delete many important questions from the U.S. Census Bureau's long form for the 1990 census.

These questions will provide substantial and important information to me and other State officials about subjects as diverse as transportation and housing, failure to obtain this information will cripple this and other State governments in carrying out important duties.

Thanks for holding hearings on this critical issue, I hope that these important questions will be restored.

MICHAEL J. CONNOLLY,  
Massachusetts Secretary of State.

STATE OF MONTANA,  
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,  
Helena, MT, August 5, 1987.

Senator JOHN MELCHER,  
Hart Senate Office Building,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR MELCHER: Early this week it was brought to my attention that the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), has suggested reducing the number of questions to be included in the 1988 Census Dress Rehearsal questionnaire. Individuals who use the information normally generated by the questionnaire are extremely concerned by this action, and are worried that the reduc-

tion indicates that these questions will not be included in the 1990 Decennial Census.

Reducing the amount and kinds of information that the census has provided in the past has serious implications for economists, demographers and other data users in Montana, as well as the rest of the nation. The OMB cites several reasons for eliminating the questions, one of which is that this information is not necessary at highly localized geographic levels. By "highly localized" the OMB means all counties and metro areas with populations under approximately two million. This, of course, would eliminate Montana entirely from much of the information normally gathered by the census.

A hearing on this matter has been convened by Senator Paul Sarbanes of Maryland, for Thursday, August 6 at 9:30 a.m. in room 628 of the Dirksen Office Building. Any personal or written testimony you can offer on the state's behalf would be appreciated. The hearing is being organized by Dan Melnick of the Congressional Research Service. He can be reached at 287-8640.

Please feel free to contact me if I can supply any additional information.

Sincerely,

KEITH L. COLBO,  
Director.

STATE OF MONTANA,  
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,  
Helena, MT, August 6, 1987.

Distribution list for materials submitted to Office of Management and Budget on the 1988 dress rehearsal Census questionnaire.

Materials telefaxed:

The Honorable Paul Sarbanes, The United States Senate, SD 332 Dirksen Senate Office Bldg., Washington, D.C. 20510.

The Honorable Ron Marlenee, The House of Representatives, Attn: Corbit Harrington, 409 Cannon House Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20515.

Materials mailed:

Wendy Gramm, Ph.D., Administrator, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, U.S. Office of Management and Budget, 1726 Jackson Place, Washington, D.C. 20503.

The Honorable Max Baucus, The United States Senate, SH-706 Hart Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20510.

The Honorable John Melcher, The United States Senate, SH-730 Hart Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20510.

The Honorable Pat Williams, The House of Representatives, 2457 Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20515.

Donald R. Arbuckle, Assistant Chief, Commerce and Lands Branch, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, U.S. Office of Management and Budget, 1726 Jackson Place, Room 3228, Washington, D.C. 20503.

Dorothy Tell, Chief, Statistical Policy Office, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, U.S. Office of Management and Budget, 1726 Jackson Place, Washington, D.C. 20503.

William P. Butz, Associate Director for Demographic Fields, U.S. Bureau of the Census, U.S. Department of Commerce, Washington, D.C. 20233.

Leo Schilling, Regional Director, U.S. Bureau of the Census, 101 Stewart St., Suite 500, Seattle, WA 98101-1098.

Theron A. Schnure, Chair, State Data Center Steering Committee, Assistant Director, Comprehensive Planning Division, Connecticut Office of Policy and Management,

80 Washington Street, Hartford, CT 06106-4459.

Association of Public Data Users, Princeton University Computer Center, 87 Prospect Avenue, Princeton, NJ 08544.

STATE OF MONTANA,  
DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE,  
Helena, MT, August 5, 1987.

HON. JAMES C. MILLER III,  
Director Office of Management and Budget,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MILLER: It has been brought to my attention that the OMB is proposing major changes in the questions to be included in the 1990 Census. As a significant user of Census data, I feel these changes would be unfortunate.

My Office is intimately involved in tax policy planning for the State of Montana. We provide information to policymakers that illustrates the effects of their policy options on taxpayers and state and local governments.

Census data provides the only source of valuable data in many instances. Examples of recent policy issues which relied on data that would be deleted under OMB's proposal include the creation of a homeowner property tax exemption and an income tax credit for rent paid. Census data had to be used to estimate for the revenue impacts on the various taxing jurisdictions and to illustrate the impacts on different types of taxpayers.

The OMB's proposed deletions, had they occurred in the 1980 Census, would have significantly reduced our ability to accurately estimate the impacts of these and other proposals.

I request that you reconsider your proposal. The information is used for important decisions and is not available from other sources.

Thank you for your consideration on this matter.

Sincerely,

STEVEN G. BENDER,  
Chief, Research Bureau.

STATE OF MONTANA,  
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,  
Helena, MT, August 5, 1987.

WENDY GRAMM,  
Administrator, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, Washington, DC.

DEAR MS. GRAMM: It is my understanding that the elimination of Questions 24a through 24d of the 1990 census is being considered.

On behalf of the Passenger Assistance Bureau of the Montana Department of Commerce, I would recommend that you not drop question 24a through 24d. The data collected by the Census Bureau in answer to that question is extremely helpful to us in assisting local communities, whether they are large or small, in meeting their public transportation needs.

Passenger Bureau staff have assisted local transportation systems in sixty-plus communities in Montana.

Staff have advised these communities in such areas as: public transportation; paratransit; home to work program; van pooling; car pooling; and coordinating with local taxi service.

Staff have assisted communities in determining the following: number of passengers per mile; cost of passenger per mile; cost per one-way trip; cost per hour; and cost per vehicle mile.

The data collected on the census report is extremely useful to us and all transit providers in providing the cost of service.

I thank you for considering the above information before making your decision.

Sincerely,

PATRICIA SAINDON,  
Chief, Passenger Bureau.

UNIVERSITY OF MONTANA,  
Missoula, MT, August 4, 1987.

DONALD R. ARBUCKLE,  
Office of Management and Budget,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. ARBUCKLE: I have received the proposed deletion of items from the 1988 Census Dress Rehearsal. If these items are also deleted from the 1990 Census, they will have a significant impact on our ability to provide timely and accurate information for Montana decision-makers.

We have two programs here at the Bureau that are designed to provide economic forecasts and demographic information for Montanans. *Economics Montana* provides forecasts for statewide and substate economic activity, which are widely quoted in the press and mailed (at no charge) to over 200 users. The County Data Packages provide timely updates of demographic information for all Montana counties; almost 1,000 requests have been made in the last two years. The users of both programs include state and local officials, business people, and private individuals. Similar information is available from no other sources.

Both of these programs will be directly affected by the deletion of items 14, 20, 21b, 23-24, 25-27, and 31. The 1990 values would provide both a reliable benchmark for our forecasts and parameter estimates for our models.

I strongly urge you not to delete these items.

Sincerely,

PAUL E. POLZIN,  
Professor and Director of Economic Forecasting.

STATE OF MONTANA,  
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,  
Helena, MT, August 5, 1987.

HON. JAMES C. MILLER III,  
Office of Management and Budget Director,  
Washington, DC

DEAR MR. MILLER: This letter is in response to your office's proposed deletion of approximately 30 questions from the questionnaire for the 1988 Census Dress Rehearsal. I strongly oppose this action. I oppose it both on general and on specific grounds.

In general it is very unwise to subvert the carefully designed and executed process of choosing questions for the 1988 and 1990 Census questionnaires. As you may know, this process included a series of 65 public meetings held throughout the country, identification of U.S. Government needs through interagency working groups and the Federal Agency Council, along with other consultations with public and private organizations. The action by the OMB Desk Officer, Donald Arbuckle, in proposing the elimination of roughly 30 questions undermines the above described process.

The Decennial Census is the source for important and useful information that is not available elsewhere. The questions proposed for elimination are of this nature. These data are not available from alternate sources, but are vital for decisions at the state and local levels, many of which involve

federal funding. The Census Bureau has ample documentation of these uses. I offer one example out of my own experience to illustrate the point.

In 1984, I produced population projections for the age group 65 and over, for each county in Montana. These projections were specifically prepared for the Montana Department of Health for use in their process of issuing certificates of need for new/expanding nursing homes. A certificate of need is required at least in part because much of the income of nursing homes comes from the Medicaid program. In order to produce county population projections for this age group, I needed historical data on migration by age. The only source for this kind of information was the 1970 and the 1980 Censuses of Population. Without this information it would have been impossible to make meaningful projections.

I strongly urge you to reverse the preliminary judgement to eliminate approximately 30 questions from the 1988 Census Dress Rehearsal Questionnaire. Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

Sincerely,

PHILLIP D. BROOKS, Ph.D.,  
State Economist.

STATE OF MONTANA, DEPARTMENT OF  
NATURAL RESOURCES AND CONSERVATION,  
Helena, MT, August 5, 1987.

WENDY GRAMM,  
Administrator, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, New Executive Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR MS. GRAMM: DNRC just today learned of OMB's plans to drop a number of questions from the 1988 Dress Rehearsal census questionnaire. We cannot agree with OMB's assessment that these are not necessary. DNRC needs reliable information on housing characteristics and fuel uses that is not available from sources other than the Census. In particular, we use information on the utilities and housing stock in our analyses of energy conservation potential and of utility system loads and reliability. These studies are required for DNRC and region-wide conservation program planning and for the utility facility licensing process.

We realize that OMB has proposed that some of these questions be moved to the sample. However, in a state as sparsely populated as Montana, a sample size that is adequate for national purposes is likely to be inadequate for the type of analyses we do. Therefore, we request that OMB retain the questions on utilities and housing as proposed by the Bureau of the Census.

Respectfully,

ALAN DAVIS,  
Chief, Planning and Analysis  
Bureau, Energy Division.

STATE OF MONTANA, DEPARTMENT OF  
COMMERCE, LOCAL GOVERNMENT  
ASSISTANCE DIVISION,  
Helena, MT, August 4, 1987.

HON. JAMES C. MILLER III,  
Director, Office of Management and Budget,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. MILLER: My office works with all Montana communities on community development, economic development, community planning, and infrastructure development matters. We are dismayed to learn of OMB's proposal to eliminate useful data from the 1990 U.S. Census. Elimination of this key data will have a substantial impact



on the ability of Montana communities to redevelop and reindustrialize.

For example, the proposal to eliminate information on sewer and water hookups will make it more difficult to finance community water and sewer systems. Financiers and financial consultants use the information to put together financing proposals. Without improved water and sewer facilities Montana business and industry will not be able to expand.

You have proposed to eliminate transportation data such as "the number of cars owned", "method of transportation to work", and "time to work". This information is used to develop and improve community transportation systems. It is particularly helpful in designing bus systems, light rail systems, and individual business van pooling systems.

The proposal to only make census socioeconomic data available for political jurisdictions with a population of 2 million or more indicates a lack of sensitivity to the needs of rural Americans, in general, and all Montanans in particular. Since the entire population of the State of Montana is only about 800,000, your proposal will mean none of the data will be available for any of Montana's 479 communities.

The elimination of this important data will be false economy. To cut it out at the federal level will shift the responsibility to state governments, local governments, and the private sector. Project development costs will increase. Taxes and private business costs charged the public will increase. Moreover, states, localities and businesses can not collect the information as cost effectively as the federal government. The manpower available for implementing the federal census can not be duplicated by any other governmental or private entity.

In summary, I urge OMB to reexamine the proposal to eliminate the census data cutbacks. The average citizen will lose—not benefit—from the data cutbacks.

Sincerely,

ROBB MCCrackEN,  
Administrative Officer,  
Community Technical  
Assistance Program.

AMERICAN PLANNING ASSOCIATION,  
Washington, DC, August 20, 1987

Re: OMB's Proposal to Eliminate Items from the 1990 Census.

Hon. PAUL S. SARBANES,  
Chairman, Joint Economic Committee,  
Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN SARBANES: This letter is being offered on behalf of the American Planning Association.

The American Planning Association is a national organization of 21,000 members, including public and private planners and elected and appointed officials at all levels of government as well as educators, students and interested citizens. Our members belong to 45 chapters covering every state and Congressional district. Many of our members use Census data on a daily basis.

APA was formed in 1978 when the American Institute of Planners, founded in 1917, and the American Society of Planning Officials, founded in 1934, consolidated. The Association's primary objective is to advance the art and science of planning for the improved development of the nation and its communities, states and regions. Within APA is the American Institute of Certified Planners which focuses on professional development. Members of AICP are distin-

guished by having met experience requirements and by having passed an examination on planning principles and practices.

APA is strongly opposed to the elimination of key population and housing data from the U.S. Census Bureau's 1988 dress rehearsal. We believe the proposal by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) is shortsighted and fails to recognize the importance of Decennial Census data in decisionmaking in both the public and private sectors. Our statement, which was prepared by David J. Robertson, Housing & Human Services Planner, Dept. of Human Services and Public Safety, Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments, will focus on the policy and decisionmaking impacts of OMB's proposal.

In seeking to justify their actions, OMB suggested the deleted data did not serve important purposes or were not needed uniformly across the nation. In reality, the deleted data are essential to measure progress and develop new alternatives in many important policy areas.

OMB's decision has drawn widespread criticism from elected officials, academic institutions, community organizations and private industry. The Decennial Census is not an isolated statistical exercise, it is an ongoing policymaking tool. Census data impacts policies and programs in such diverse areas as housing, education, energy, transportation, child care, health care, and employment.

APA is particularly concerned about the impact of the proposed elimination of questions pertaining to housing. Approximately two-thirds of the 30 questions considered by OMB for elimination are directly linked to housing. The loss of these data would jeopardize the ability of both the public and private sectors to meet the still unmet challenge of a "decent home and a suitable living environment" mandated by the Housing Act of 1949.

If the OMB proposal is implemented, decisionmakers at every level will lose their most valuable tool: information.

The following four points illustrate how decisionmaking in housing programs would be affected:

(1) The Section 8 Existing Housing Certificate program represents a major housing initiative that enables lower income households to obtain affordable and decent housing. A key element of this program is the periodic publication by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) of fair market rents for communities throughout the nation. The rental data proposed for elimination would hamper the ability of HUD and local housing agencies to update this information, upon which millions of dollars in housing assistance depend.

(2) The housing affordability crisis affects many communities throughout the nation, both large and small. Federal funding for housing and community development programs has been cut by more than 70 percent since 1981 prompting many state and local governments to respond with a variety of local housing initiatives. These new initiatives, however, are jeopardized by the loss of important population, housing condition and utilization data, which are used to develop programs and monitor performance. If communities are expected to target scarce local resources, they need the comprehensive data produced by the Decennial Census.

(3) Some of the information proposed for deletion would impact on the ability to administer current Federal programs, such as

the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program. Data on overcrowding and the condition of the housing stock would be lost under the OMB proposal, which are important measures required by HUD for CDBG allocation.

(4) New Federal legislation creating programs to aid the homeless will require each jurisdiction to adopt a Comprehensive Homeless Assistance Plan. How can local governments adequately plan to meet the housing needs of our nation's homeless if we are denied accurate data on our housing stock?

The data that the OMB is proposing to eliminate is also used for a variety of public policy decisionmaking for programs other than housing and community development:

Local governments rely on data on the source of water, public sewers and plumbing facilities to plan for adequate water supplies and wastewater treatment facilities. Private utility companies also depend on utility, fuel and other housing data to make decisions on new plant construction and utility rates, involving investments of millions of dollars. This nation cannot afford to be unprepared in the event of another energy crisis, due to a lack of data.

State and local governments rely heavily on journey-to-work data for transportation planning. Key decisions on land development and traffic impact are made using this data which few, if any, local governments would be able to collect on their own. Multi-million dollar public highway and mass transit projects, along with private investment, hinge on the transportation data proposed for elimination.

Funds allocated under the Job Training Partnership Act are largely based on labor force data also proposed for elimination. The effectiveness of local programs to train and employ unemployed workers would be jeopardized under the OMB plan.

In offering this proposal, the OMB suggested that data may not be needed at a national level, or that data may be more appropriately collected by a smaller sample, or in a more specific geographic area. APA views this approach as unwise and inefficient. Although the solutions to our nation's and communities' problems may require different approaches, the basic information needed to make those evaluations is the same. Local communities, particularly rural areas, may not have adequate resources to collect and analyze locally collected data. It is simply not cost effective to require thousands of communities to collect individually the same data collected by the Decennial Census on a national level.

Not only is OMB's decision ill-founded, but their process in reaching this decision has been unfair. OMB has chaired the Federal Agency Council for the 1990 Census since 1984 and has been involved in the preparation and review of proposed questions since that date. During all these months of deliberation between OMB, the Bureau of the Census, Federal agencies and data users, OMB failed to express any concern about the application of the Paperwork Reduction Act. Only on July 24, 1987, just before the Congressional recess, and with only two months for public comment, did OMB indicate its intention to eliminate key housing and other demographic data, citing their responsibility under the Paperwork Reduction Act. Although time remaining before the 1990 Census is growing short, it is imperative that the views of local communities, data users, and other concerned with

the Census be heard before an irreversible decision is made.

Rather than attempt to alter the 1988 dress rehearsal at this late date, OMB should rely on the judgment of Census officials and staff. The 1988 dress rehearsal is the product of some of the most noted demographic and statistical experts in the nation, and reflects the input of data users in both the public and private sectors. OMB should respect the professional expertise that developed the 1988 Census dress rehearsal.

APA does not view the Decennial Census as just another government program. The Census was one of the first acts of our newly formed republic in 1790 and has enjoyed the support of the American people for almost 200 years. The American people respect the Census and comply because they understand the value of information in a democratic society. Census data enable government, industry, and private citizens to better understand our past, view our present, and to plan for our future. The time that it takes for respondents to complete the Census questionnaire is a wise investment that will enable the nation to plan for our needs as we approach the 21st century.

Senator Sarbanes, the American Planning Association is most appreciative of your conscientious inquiry into this important subject and your Committee and its staff are to be commended for holding this hearing on such short notice prior to the Congressional recess.

We hope that Congress and the Joint Economic Committee will do all within their power to see that the proposal by OMB to eliminate so many necessary items from the 1990 Census is not implemented.

Thank you for the opportunity to express the views of the American Planning Association on this subject. We would be delighted to assist the Committee to see that the Census is restored to being a compilation of data that is truly useful for public and private decisionmaking.

Sincerely,

LINDA E. HOLLIS, AICP,  
Chair, National/State Policy  
Coordinating Committee.

#### NOTICE OF DETERMINATION BY THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON ETHICS

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, it is required by paragraph 4 of rule 35 that I place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD notices of Senate employees who participate in programs, the principal objective of which is educational, sponsored by a foreign government or a foreign educational or charitable organization involving travel to a foreign country paid for by that foreign government or organization.

The select committee has received a request for a determination under rule 35, for Mr. William Mansel Long, a member of the staff of Senator HOWELL HEFLIN, to participate in a program in the Republic of China in Taiwan, sponsored by Soochow University, from August 14-24, 1987.

The committee has determined that participation by Mr. Long in the program in the Republic of China in Taiwan, at the expense of Soochow

University, is in the interest of the Senate and the United States.

#### TRIBUTE TO DONALD BROWN

● Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I am proud to rise, today, to offer my congratulations to Donald Brown, of Florence, AL, who has recently accepted a position as executive editor of the Tuscaloosa News. While I am sorry to see Don and his wife, Hannah, leave the Shoals area, where Don has served with the TimesDaily since 1981, first as assistant to the publisher, and as editor since 1983, I know they will be happy in Tuscaloosa. Yet, I also know that they will be leaving many friends behind.

Throughout his tenure with the TimesDaily, Don possessed a professionalism that distinguished him as a newspaperman. In the 6 years he spent with the newspaper, he served under six publishers who were each very pleased with his dedication and his work. During that time, he provided a consistency and a stability to the paper, but also to his community. He helped to keep the citizens of the Shoals area informed of the many issues which affected our community, State, and Nation. I have always believed that a democracy is only as strong as the knowledge and understanding of the people who comprise it. Because of Don's efforts, we in the Shoals area have had a paper which has helped to perform this valuable task. Don Brown helped to make the TimesDaily one of the best newspapers of its size in the entire country. He has helped to make it the people's paper, which reports the news that affects them, and which contains the information on which they rely from day to day.

Don and Hannah also devoted a great deal of time to efforts which have helped the Shoals area. I believe that the Shoals area is a much better place for their having spent 6 years of their lives living and working as a vital part of our community. And I know that the citizens of Tuscaloosa will, likewise, welcome them and be grateful for their efforts. I wish Don and Hannah continued success and happiness, and hope to see them when I visit the Tuscaloosa area.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the attached newspaper articles be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. One is an editorial that Donald Brown wrote on his work in the Shoals, and the other is an article that appeared after the announcement that Don Brown was leaving the TimesDaily.

The articles are as follows:

[From the TimesDaily, July 12, 1987]

**TIMESDAILY EDITOR ACCEPTS NEW POSITION**

(By Donald Brown)

The promotion of Donald Brown, editor of the TimesDaily, to executive editor of The

Tuscaloosa News was announced Saturday by Steven Ainsley, TimesDaily publisher. The position becomes effective July 17. Ainsley said Brown's successor will be named in the near future.

Brown, 50, has been editor of the TimesDaily since January 1983. He joined the newspaper in August 1981, and was assistant to the publisher until named editor by then-publisher R. Guy Hankins.

The Tuscaloosa News is owned by The New York Times Co., as are the TimesDaily and the Gadsden Times.

"Don is a strong editor, whose professional standards have served our newspaper and the Shoals area well," Ainsley said. "He has led the TimesDaily newsroom through major expansion programs, and under his leadership the newspaper has achieved a level of editorial excellence that is recognized statewide."

"Don's sincere regard for the Shoals has earned him the respect of our readers during the six years he has been with the TimesDaily. His even-handed approach to the events which have shaped our area during his tenure as editor, and his willingness to involve himself in community projects will be remembered long after his departure. All of us at the paper wish him the best of success in Tuscaloosa."

Charles Land, publisher of The Tuscaloosa News, said, "I have known Don Brown for many years, going back to his reporting days in Birmingham, and I am delighted to have a newspaper man of his caliber joining The News' management team."

"Don has done an excellent job as editor in Florence, where he has led the way to significant improvements in the newspaper there in these past few years. Don and his wife, Hannah, have been active in their community, too, and we look forward to having them as citizens of our community," Land said.

Brown said he would always appreciate the opportunity the TimesDaily, and The New York Times Co. afforded him in the Shoals. "I especially acknowledge the responsive readers of our newspaper and those who depend so heavily upon our local news coverage. Those kinds of challenges produce professional growth," he said.

"I salute the news staff, whose hard work and dedication have gained for the TimesDaily recognition as the best newspaper of its size in Alabama for the past three years," said Brown.

The TimesDaily won general excellence awards from state press associations in Louisiana, Florida and Georgia in 1984-85-86. Awards for 1987 will be announced next weekend at the Alabama Press Association's convention at Gulf Shores.

Brown began his newspaper career as a copy boy at The Birmingham News in 1953. He was a reporter there for eight years, leaving in 1965 to become assistant to the president for public relations at Birmingham-Southern College, his alma mater.

He was editor of Birmingham Magazine and public relations director at the Birmingham Area Chamber of Commerce, 1956-1977, then was communications director at the Birmingham-Jefferson Civic Center, 1977-81.

**TO THE SHOALS, IT'S BEEN GOOD TO KNOW  
YOU**

(By Donald Brown)

Loving a newspaper is much like loving one's children. You watch them develop and grow, guiding but trying not to hover. You



want them to turn out strong and independent, but occasionally aren't proud of the decisions they make. Yet you never stop caring and when the time comes, as inevitably it will, you don't want to let them go.

I have known the Times-Daily for six years and loved her for almost that long. In 1981 her outspoken publisher, the late and fine Bailey Anderson, allowed me to join the staff and thus brought me home again to the work place I know best and enjoy most, a newsroom.

After Bailey's tragically early death to cancer, there followed a succession of publishers, each of whom left his mark on the sphere of this newspaper: Gary Greene, Guy Hankins, John Fitzwater and now Steve Ainsley.

It has been my privilege to work for the latter three as editor. And because of my move to the Tuscaloosa News, which takes effect Friday, add another publisher, Charles Land. As Ainsley noted in our newest employee newsletter, "... Don will have worked for six publishers in six years ... no small feat."

Succinctly said, considering this position serves at the publisher's pleasure and that an editor's first and greatest mandate is to implement the boss' policies in news. I didn't have to agree but more than once was smacked with the reality that his view was all that counted. Each publisher has required certain loyalties.

Hannah and I leave the Shoals grateful for the good and true friends we cultivated, whose support was there when we needed it and who will always be warm and welcome parts of us. Surprisingly, we also found that not being boat people and not living on the water didn't keep us from adopting the river, or from being fulfilled by its serenity and majesty on so many early mornings.

We have delighted in telling our friends elsewhere how much there is to do here. And we will miss the live-wire Helen Keller and W.C. Handy festivals, the plays and musicals of our community theaters, the active art centers, the spectrum of universi-

ty events and especially the tradition of energetic togetherness all these assets embody.

I leave educated to the importance of this newspaper to these many communities many of us have come to call the Shoals. The Times-Daily is a personal part of thousands of lives; and it is not overstating our role to say that gratitude or anger, success or failure are often measured by what we report and the stands we take. That's what so many of you have told me, more times than I can remember. Such responsibility goes with the territory of a locally-focused newspaper, yet is a burden that never lightens.

Decisions that sometimes have upset, disappointed and even infuriated some of you have come with the job, too. Never were they lightly made, and none were ever unmade because of pressure and reactions.

I have made mistakes. Anyone constantly required to make judgment calls will miss some. But mistakes made despite the best of intentions are still no excuse, and have value only if you can work through them, learn from them and don't repeat them.

None of that, however, figured into this decision; it turned mostly on the chance to take an opportunity we believe is right, and move to a place we hope to like as much as we have enjoyed living here.

I leave proud of the steps this area has taken to begin putting aside historic differences and individualism for the good of the whole. At times the newspaper has focused on the need for change, but it is you who have wanted it, you who made it happen.

As more of us accept the fact that the very outsiders we want to recruit to live and work here see us as one area—and do not divide us by county lines or by the river or by politics—our growth will occur as it should.

If I could leave a so-called last will and testament, as high school graduating classes used to do, I'd predict these future headlines for the Times-Daily: Bridge construction begins; New bridge dedicated; Colbert

cities merge services; Employment at record high; Local expansions key economic growth; Music Hall of Fame opens; 157 four-laned; Cooperative business climate halted; Browns Ferry powers up.

News to report, stories to write, deadlines to meet—and the challenges go on.●

#### TRIBUTE TO GEORGIA STATE REPRESENTATIVE PEGGY CHILDS

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to a fellow Georgian, State Representative Peggy Childs, who died of cancer on July 8, 1987.

Peggy Childs was a former teacher, who served our State in that most valuable capacity. She was first elected to the Georgia House of Representatives in 1974. She was re-elected six times from her home district in the city of Decatur. Representative Childs was a tireless worker and reached a position of influence on the Appropriation and Judiciary Committees, and was vice chairman of the Retirement Committee.

Even after learning she had cancer, this gallant lady returned to college, obtained her law degree and joined her husband in the practice of law. One of her last acts in the legislature was to pass a bill restricting the sale of cigarettes to young Georgians under the age of 18.

She showed her concern that others should have a good life, even when hers was almost used up. She was a great lady. All Georgia is proud of her, and she will be missed by all her many friends.